EXHIBIT 3

4831-2540-6125 V2

OBJECTION TO INSTRUCTION NO. 3

The Subpoenas each assert in Instruction No. 3 that "[p]ursuant to Federal Rule 26(e), these requests are continuing in nature." But the Non-parties are not subject to the continuing obligations imposed on parties under Rule 26(e).

RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

All Communications between You and the U.S. Food & Drug Administration related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

The Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, assuming facts not in evidence, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The Non-parties further object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

All Documents and Communications between You and the U.S. Food & Drug Administration related to Monster Products, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, assuming facts not in evidence, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what the Non-parties understand are the needs of this litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine.

Exhibit 3, Page 34

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

All Communications between You and the Bursor & Fisher law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

All Communications between You and the Nathan & Associates law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

All Communications between You and the Barbat, Mansour & Suciu law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

All Communications between You and the Kohn, Swift & Graf law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

All Communications between You and the Greg Coleman law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

All Communications between You and the Kercsmar & Feltus law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:

All Communications between You and the Alderman Law Firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:

All Communications between You and the Levin Fishbein Sedran & Berman or Levin Sedran & Berman law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

All Communications between You and Harke Law LLP (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

All Communications between You and the Barnow & Associates law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

All Communications between You and the Lite DePalma Greenberg law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

All Communications between You and any other law firm (including any attorneys, paralegals, employees, agents or representatives) in the United States related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date. (This request excludes any firms or attorneys representing or retained by Monster.)

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the term "related to" is vague and ambiguous and, as defined, overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests

Exhibit 3, Page 40

1 2 information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

3

4

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

All Documents and Communications related to media press releases, media statements, and media interviews related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date. (This request excludes Your internal firm communications, communications with Monster, and communications with other firms or attorneys representing or retained by Monster.)

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request on the basis that the terms "media press releases," "media statements, "media interviews," and "related to" are vague and overly broad. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

All Documents and Communications related to VPX, Owoc, or Bang, regardless of date. (This request excludes Your internal firm communications, communications with Monster, and communications with other firms or attorneys representing or retained by Monster.)

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

The Non-parties object to this Request as harassing, vague, ambiguous, overly broad, assumes facts not in evidence, unreasonably cumulative and duplicative, and

unlimited in time and scope. The subject matter of this request is not relevant or proportional to what Non-parties understand are the needs of the present litigation. Non-parties also object to this Request to the extent it requests information protected by attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, and/or the common interest privilege. Dated: November 22, 2019 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. Attorneys for Non-Parties Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P. and Marc P. Miles Exhibit 3, Page 42 PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTIONS TO SUBPOENAS

CASE NO. 5:18-CV-1882-JGB

Case 5:18-cv-01882-JGB-SHK Document 164-8 Filed 01/22/20 Page 11 of 11 Page ID